# NOTIFICATION.

Bangalore, dated 13th September 1966

**S. O 3096.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 117 of the Mysore Land Reforms Act, 1961 (Mysore Act 10 of 1962), the Government of Mysore hereby constitutes for each of the districts or groups of districts specified in column 2 of the following Table an Appellate Authority consisting of the District Judge specified in the corresponding entry of column 3 of the said Table.

TABLE.

| Sl. No. | District or Districts | District Judge |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 1 | Bangalore District | District Judge, Bangalore |
| 2 | Belgaum District | District Judge, Belgaum |
| 3 | Bellary District | District Judge, Bellary |
| 4 | Bidar District | District Judge, Bidar |
| 5 | Bijapur District | District Judge, Bijapur |
| 6 | Chitradurga District | District Judge, Chitradurga |
| 7 | Coorg District | District Judge, Coorg. |
| 8 | Dharwar District | District Judge, Dharwar |
| 9 | Gulbarga District | District Judge, Gulbarga |
| 10 | Kolar District | District Judge, Kolar |
| 11 | Mysore, Mandya and Hassan Districts. | District Judge, Mysore |
| 12 | North Kanara District | District Judge, Karwar (North Kanara) |
| 13 | Raichur District | District Judge, Raichur |
| 14 | Shimoga and Chickmagalur Districts. | District Judge, Shimoga |
| 15 | South Kanara District | District Judge, Mangalore (South Kanara) |
| 16 | Tumkur District | District Judge, Tumkur. |

[No. RD 86 (1) LRY 65.]

By Order and in the name of the Governor of Mysore,

860

B. S. SRIKANTIAH, *Secy.*

Printed by the Director of Printing, Sty. & Publications at the Govt. Press, B'lore.

2C-ii—7

# PART IV

## Section 2-C—(II)

## STATUTORY ORDERS ISSUED BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT UNDER THE CENTRAL ACTS AND STATE ACTS.

### PUBLIC HEALTH, LABOUR AND MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION SECRETARIAT.

### GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

### (LABOUR DEPARTMENT).

*Labour Dispute.*—Industrial Dispute between the Workmen and the Management of M/s. Gubgal Estate, Javali Post, Chickmagalur District

Award of the Labour Court, Bangalore—Published.

READ the following papers :—

1. Letter No. 508/65-66, dated 13th August 1965 from Shri P. T. Kadkol, Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Bangalore.

### BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, BANGALORE.

*Dated this 13th day of August 1965.*

**Present :**

Sri P. T. Kadkol, B.Sc, LL.B., *Presiding Officer.*

**Reference No. 8 OF 1965.**

Workmen represented by the Secretary, Mysore National Plantation Workers' Union, Jayapura, Chickmagalur District.

*I Party.*

*and*

The Management of M/s. Gubgal Estate, Javali Post, Chickmagalur District.

... *2 Party.*

REFERENCE : Government Order No. PLM 504 LLD 64, dated 23rd March 1965.

## AWARD

The Government of Mysore, being of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the workmen and the management of the Gubgal Estate, Javali Post, Chikamagalur District, have referred it for adjudication to this court, by their Order No. PLM 504 LLD 64, dated March 23, 1965, setting out the following points of dispute, for adjudication, *viz.*, :—

> "1. Whether the management was justified in refusing Maistry work to Sri Kangan with effect from 6-3-1965? If not, whether Sri Kangan was entitled to reinstatement with back wages as Maistry or any other relief.
>
> Whether the management was justified in extracting Maistry work from Sri Kangan for cooly wages during 1-7-1963 to 5-3-1964? If not, whether Sri Kangan was entitled to diffrence in wages for the period he worked as a maistry?"

2. The cause of the aggrieved workman is sponsored by the Mysore National Plantation Workers' Union, Jayapura, Chickmagalur District, which is a registered Trade Union. This Union, as representing the workman, is the First Party and the Management of the Gubgal Estate is the Second Party in this proceeding. The Union is represented by its General Secretary, Mr. Susainathan and the Management by Mr. O'Brien, the Manager of the Estate.

3. The averments made by the Union in the claim statement are :—

> Kangan entered service as a daily rated worker in 1956 and was promoted as a Maistry on 1-7-63 ; he worked as Maistry till 5-3-1964; on 6-3-1964 he was told orally that he would not be given Maistry's work and was asked to work as a daily rated cooly ; he was thus reduced in rank and his service conditions were altered without holding any enquiry against him and without giving him any opportunity to defend himself , this act of the Management is unjust, illegal and arbitrary and violative of all principles of natural justice; during the period between 1-7-1963 and 5-3-1964, though Maistry's work was being taken from him, he was being paid only cooly wages , this is equally unjust and illegal ; hence the Management should be directed to

reinstate him in Maistry's post, with full back wages and also pay him the difference between the Maistry's wages and cooly wages for the period during which Maistry work was being taken from him etc.

4. The contentions raised by the Management in the counter statement are :—

Kangan was promoted as a Maistry on probation for one year from 1-7-1963 with two conditions, namely, (1) that he would be reverted as cooly at any time during that period, if his work was found unsatisfactory and (2) that during the period of probation, he would be paid only an adult cooly's wages ; Kangan has signed the agreement containing these conditions ; a complaint was made to the Management on 6-3-1964, that he had eaten up the food brought and kept in a Tiffin Carrier by a woman worker, in her absence ; when questioned by the Management, Kangan admitted having eaten the food of the woman worker and that it was wrong on his part to do so on the same day, the Management, being of opinion that he was unfit or unworthy of holding the post of a Maistry reverted him as a cooly and asked him to go for pruning; he did not go for work as cooly on that day or on any day thereafter, then a complaint was given to the Management that he had remained absent without leave from 6th to 19th March; hence the Management charge-sheeted him for misconduct on the ground of his contiuned absence, held an enquiry against him in his presence and found him guilty and warned him and also confirmed his reversion as cooly; for all these reasons, he is not entitled to any of the reliefs claimed by him and by the First Party on his behalf; hence the Reference be rejected, etc.

5. When the matter came up before me at Chickmagalur Camp on 27-5-1965, I heard the opening statements of Mr. Susainathan and Mr. O'Brien and perused the copies of the documents produced by the latter called upon the Management to produce the original agreement said to have been executed by Kangan and the Union, to give its say, about that document as also the enquiry said to have been held by the Management. During the course of the opening statements, it was disclosed that Kangan had left off the

service on the Estate, of his own accord. The Union was called upon to give the date on which he left the service (*Vide* Order passed in the Order Sheet under date 27-5 1965, below which the representatives of both parties have signed).

6. In obedience to this order, the Management sent by post the original document said to have been executed by Kangan. The Union has given its clarification and answers to the questions put by the Court in its written statement dated 12-6-1965. Therein it has said:—

> Kangan has put his thumb mark on the agreement, without knowing its contents but on a false representation made to him that it was an order promoting him as a Maistry; an enquiry was held regarding his continued absence, but during the enquiry, extraneous matters, not covered by the charge were introduced; the enquiry is bad, being violative of all principles of natural justice; absence without leave is not a misconduct; the Estate has not got any certified Standing Orders of its own; Kangan left his service on 5-3-1964, etc.

7. On the basis of these pleadings, the following issues have been set down for hearing:—

1. Does the point of dispute No. 1 mentioned in the Order of Reference survive, when, admittedly, Kangan has left the service under the Second Party, on 5-3-1964?
2. If it survives, is it proved by the First Party that the Management was not justified in refusing Maistry work to him?
3. Can he be reinstated as Maistry, when he is not in the service of the Second Party?
4. Is the domestic enquiry held by the Second Party bad in law?
5. Does the First Party prove that the document dated 1-7-1963 was taken by the Management from Kangan making the false representation mentioned in the written statement dated 12.6-1965?
6. Does the Second Party prove that it is entitled to enter into an agreement of the kind mentioned in the document dated 1-7-1963?

7. Does such an agreement amount to unfair labour practice?

8. Is Kangan entitled to Maistry's wages from 1-7-1963 to 5-8-1964?

9. What award?

Parties were given liberty to lead evidence with respect to all thes issues.

8. The First party has examined the aggrieved workman Kangan (W. W. 1) and has not produced any documents. The Second Party has produced five doucuments (Exts. M. 1 to M. 5) and has not led any oral evidence. This is all the evidence in this case. The case for the First Party was argued by Mr. Susainathan and that for the Management by Mr O'Brien.

9. The first three issues set down for hearing by me completely cover the first point of dispute set out in the order of Reference made by the Government. The Order of Reference is dated March 23, 1965 and Kangan has abandoned the service under the Second Party on March 6, 1964. I am not in a position to know whether Government was appraised of the fact that Kangan had voluntarily abandoned his service with effect from the 5th or the 6th of March 1964, at the time the Order of Reference was passed. Any way, in my opinion, the first point of dispute does not survive because, Kangan was no longer a workman falling within the definition of that term as given in Section 2 (s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, either at or about the date, the order of Reference was made or at the date, the dispute is likely to have been raised. According to the definition, "workman" means :—

(a) Any person (including an apprentice) employed in any industry to do any skilled or unskilled manual, supervisory, technical or clerical work for hire or reward whether the terms of employment be expressed or implied.

Then for the purposes of any proceeding under the Act in relation to an Industrial Dispute, warkman includes :—

(b) Any such person who has been dismissed, discharged or retrenched in connection with or as a consequence of that dispute ; or

(c) Any such person whose dismissal, discharge or retrenchment has led to that Industrial Dispute.

10. It is not the case of the first party that Kangan has been dismissed or discharged or retrenched from service by the Management of the Second Party. Kangan has stated in paragraph No. 8 of his deposition in the examination-in-chief itself :—

> "I left the job in the Opponent Estate, because I was refused work as a Maistry and was asked to work as a cooly. I left the job in the Opponent Estate on 5th March 1964."

From this admission made by Kangan himself, it is evident that he cannot be considered as a "Workman" either under clause (b) or clause (c) of the definition, which has been reproduced above. He cannot be considered as a workman under clause (a) also, because that clause applies only to persons who are in service in presently, and admittedly Kangan is not in service since 6th March 1964. Kangan cannot possibly have raised this dispute and the First Party Union cannot possibly have espoused his cause and made the demands on his behalf before 6th March 1964. It follows therefore, that, Kangan was not a "workman" within the meaning of Section 2 (s) of the Act, either at the date the dispute was raised or at the date the Order of Reference was made. It is only a person who has been dismissed or discharged from service by the Management or whose services have been terminated by the Management, that can be directed to be reinstated under the Industrial Laws, if the order passed by the Management is found to be incorrect. illegal or unjustified. A person who has abandoned his service voluntarily cannot ask the Industrial Court to direct the Management to reinstate him in service. The demand of the First Party comes to this; Kangan was refused work as Maistry by the Management on unjustifiable grounds; hence he left his service; and so, this court should hold that the act of the Management in refusing Maistry's work to Kangan was unjustified and Kangan's refusal to work as cooly and his subsequent abandonment of service were justified and then direct the Management to take him back in service as Maistry. But the question whether Kangan was or was not justified in refusing to work as cooly and whether he was or was not justified in staying away from service are beyond the scope of the present Reference. This Court cannot enlarge the scope of the Reference nor is it entitled to travel beyond it. In any event, therefore, Kangan is not entitled to an Order for reinstatement. Hence I record my finding on the third issue formulated by me and the second part of the first point of dispute as set out in the Order of Reference, in the negative.

11. In view of this conclusion reached by me the first part of the first point of dispute as set out in the order of Reference does not survive at all in so far as the question of reinstatement is concerned. But this court has been called upon to decide whether Kangan is entitled to any other relief, if it be held that he is not entitled to reinstatement with back wages. So, I proceed to consider the question whether the Management was justified in refusing to give Maistry work to Kangan. This is the subject matter of issue No. 2 formulated by me, and the first part of the first point of dispute in the Order of Reference.

12. I should mention here that the aggrieved workman Kangan is also called by an *alias* name, as "Ganga". Admittedly he entered service of the Second Party as a daily rated cooly in 1957 or 1958 and worked as such till 30th June 1963. It is also admitted on both hands that he was promoted as Maistry on 1st July 1963 and worked in that capacity till he left service on 6th March 1964. It is further admitted by both the parties that the Management refused Maistry work to Kangan on that day and asked him to work as an ordinary cooly. According to the First Party, this act on the part of the Management was not justified. The case of the Management, on the other hand, is that Kangan had been promoted as Maistry on probation for one year, on the express condition that he would be reverted during the period of probation, if his work was found unsatisfactory. To prove this fact, the Management relies on the document Ex. M. 5, which can be construed as an agreement entered into by Kangan (described in Ex. M. 5 as Ganga) with the Management, at the time of his promotion. Ex. M. 5 is in the English language. It is attested by one witness. Below the text, Kangan has made his thumb mark. It is dated 1st July 1963. Therein, Kangan has agreed to be promoted as a Maistry on probation for one year and further agreed to the Management reverting him in case it found him "unfit to perform the Maistry's job". It is urged by Mr. Susainathan that this document Ex. M. 5, is, *prima facie*, suspicious because Kangan, who is able to sign his name, could be expected to sign below it, instead of making his thumb mark. But to this doubt entertained by him, Kangan himself has given an effective answer in his deposition, stating that even in the payment registers he has made his thumb marks and the Management takes only the thumb marks of the workman, whether they be literate or illiterate. So, no suspicion can attach to Ex. M. 5 on the ground that Kangan, though he can sign, has made his thumb mark on it. The second contention of Mr. Susainathan is that

the Maurgement has obtained the thumb mark of Kangan on Ex. M. 5 without letting him know its real contents and falsely representing to him that it was only an order promoting him as Maistry. But no satisfactory evidence has been led to prove this contention, beyond the highly interested word of Kangan himself. There was no reason or motive for the Management to play fraud on a workman, whom it was going to promote to a higher post. The very fact that Kangan was promoted indicates that the relations between him and the Management were good and that his past work had been appreciated. Moreover another condition in Ex. M. 5 is that though promoted as Maistry, Kangan should draw the wages of only an adult cooly during the period of probation Kangan has actually accepted the cooly wages during the said period. He has not raised any dispute regarding his wages during the said period. This means that Kangan was aware of the conditions of his promotion as Maistry and had accepted them and both the parties had acted upon them. In view of these facts, I have no hesitation in holding that Ex. M. 5 is a genuine document and that Kangan has executed it with full knowledge of its contents and not under the influence of any false representation made to him. This conclusion disposes of issue No. 5 on which I record my finding in the negative.

13. Now, I proceed to consider the question whether the Management was or was not justified in refusing the Maistry work to Kangan. The case made out by the Management in the counter statement is that a complaint was lodged with it on 6th March 1964 to the effect that Kangan had eaten the food brought by a lady worker, in her absence on work elsewhere and when questioned Kangan admitted it and asked to be excused. His apology was not accepted by the Management. His conduct in eating the food brought by another worker, in her absence, was considered by the Management to be an act unworthy of a Maistry and so the Management told him that he should no longer work as a Maistry, but go on working as an ordinary cooly. This statement of fact made by the Management in the counter Statement, has not been denied by Kangan either in the written Statement, dated 12th June 1965 or in his deposition recorded on 26th July 1965, by me. During the course of the domestic enquiry (to which I would refer later) he has admitted that he had eaten the food of one lady worker by name Kamala when she was away, as he was hungry. It cannot be denied that this act of Kangan is very unworthy of any one and more so, of a Maistry who occu-

pies a fiduciary position with respect to the workers under him. If on this account, the Management thought that Kangan was unworthy of continuing as a Maistry, its act in refusing Maistry work to him, especially when he was on probation, cannot at all be said to be unjustified. I would even say that stealing the food of a worker in his absence is misconduct. What punishment should be given for misconduct, is purely a management function. An industrial court cannot interfere with the punishment given by the Management unless it is shockingly excessive. It is not so, in the present case. It has not been alleged and much less proved that the act of the Management is *mala fide* and it refused to give Maistry work to Kangan due to some ulterior motives. I am, therefore, of the view that it cannot be said that the Management was not Justified in refusing Maistry work to Kangan. Hence I record my finding on Issue No-2 and the first part of the first point of dispute set out in the Order of Reference against Kangan.

14. Now, I proceed to consider the fourth issue. It may be recalled here that on 6th March 1964, Kangan was refused work as Maistry and was directed to work as a cooly. He did not go to work as cooly. He absented himself from duty. On 19th March 1964, the overseer of the Estate (Mr. Setty) made a report to the Assistant Manager (*Vide* Ex. M. 3) stating that Kangan had absented himself from work from March 6, and asking the latter to take such action against Kangan, as he deemed fit. On 20th March 1964, the Assistant Manager (Mr. Otter) issued the charge sheet. Ex. M. 1, to Kangan regarding his continued absence, treating it as misconduct. It was received by Kangan. Then an enquiry was held with respect to the charge (Ex. M. 1) in the persence of Kangan. He was found guilty of the charge (Ex. M. 4, pages 1 to 4.) Thereafter, the Management issued the order, Ex. M. 2, to Kangan on 6th April 1964. The Order runs as under:—

> "Sri Ganga employed as a worker on Gubgal Estate is informed that as he is not found fit to be made a Maistry, by the Management, he is reverted as per his letter dated 1st July 1963 from a trainee to his former position as a cooly with effect from 6th March 1964, the date on which he was verbally informed by the Assistant Manager."

15. Mr. Susainathan is now attacking the enquiry as bad in law and as violative of the principles of natural justice. The

ground of the attack is that during the enquiry (Ex. M. 4) the incident of 6th March 1964 (eating the food of Kamala) was introduced, without any charge having been framed about it. But on perusing the records, I find that, the story regarding the incident of 6th March 1964, was given out as a part of the evidence which led to Kangan being asked to work as a cooly from 6th March 1964, refusing him Maistry work from that day. Part of the incident has been given out by one withness but the whole story has been given out by Kangan himself. On this ground therefore, it cannot be said that the domestic enquiry is bad in law. Nor can it be said to be voilnative of the principles of natural Justice. No other grounds are urged to show that the domestic enquire is bad. In view of these facts, I record my finding on issue No. 4 in the negative.

16. The next question is whether Kangan is entitled to Maistry's wages during the period that he worked as Maistry. The management urges that he is not entitled to Maistry's wages in view of the agreement at Ex. M. 5. Admittedly, the Estate has no certified Standing Orders, authorising the Management to pay a lower rate of wages during the period of probation. The normal rule is that every workman should be paid the wages prescribed for the duty he is asked to perform. This would be an implied term or condition of the service of the workman. Then it may be noted that in Ex. M. 5, the word "Trainee" has not been used, though this word has been used in Ex. M. 2. There is a lot difference between a person put on a job as a "Trainee" and a person put on the job "on probation". The two cannot be equated. A person on probation is in full charge of the job, whereas a trainee is supposed to work on the job under some other person, who is supposed to train him in the job, with a view to take full charge of the job at the end of the training. A trainee may be asked to take the training on a contracted wage rate, but not a probationer, unless such a contract rate is sanctioned by the service conditions or certified standing orders. Such is not the case now. The agreement or contract in Ex. M. 5, that Kangan should do the job of a Maistry but take the wages of a cooly is something amounting to an unfair labour practice, in the absence of standing orders authorising the Management to do so. Mr. O' Brien appearing for the Management has not been able to satisfy me that the Management is entitled to enter into such a contract with its workmen. Hence I record my finding on issue No. 6 in the Negative and on issue No. 7 in the affirmative.

17. It follows, therefore, that Kangan is entitled to Maistry Wages from 1st July 1963 to 5th March 1964, both days inclusive. Hence I record my finding on Issue No. 8 in the affirmative.

18. In view of the conclusions reached by me, I pass the following Award.

## AWARD.

1. Reference is partly accepted. The Management is directed to pay the aggrieved workman Kangan *alias* Ganga, the difference between the Maistry Wages due to him and cooly wages actually paid to him, for the period between 1st July 1963 and 5th March 1964, both days inclusive within fifteen days of the publication of this Award in the *Mysore Government Gazette*. The other demands made by Kangan *alias* Ganga and the first party on his behalf, are rejected. Parties to bear their own costs.

(Sd.) P. T. KADKOL,
*Presiding Officer,*
*Labour Court, Bangalore.*

" Copy

P. T. KADKOL,
*Presiding Officer,*
*Labour Court, Bangalore.*

## APPENDIX

List of witnesses examined in this case on behalf of

*I Party* :

W. W. 1 Sri Kangan

*II Party*

Nil

List of documents admitted in this case on behalf of

*I Party* :

Nil

*II Party* :

Ex. M. 1 Charge Sheet, dated 20-3-1964.
2 Order reverting Kangan as Cooly.
3 Report of Overseer dated. 19-3- 1964.
4 Enquiry Proceedings
5 Agreement dated 1.7.1963 between Kangan and Management.

*2nd Party*

(Sd.) P T. KADKOL,
*Presiding Officer,*
*Labour Court, Bangalore.*

"Copy"

P. T. KADKOL,
*Presiding Officer,*
*Labour Court, Bangalore.*

## ORDER.

Bangalore, dated the 29th August 1965.

**S. O. 3098.**—WHEREAS by State Government Order No. PLM 504 LLD 64, dated 23rd March 1965, the Industrial Dispute between the Workmen and the Management of M/s. Gubgal Estate, Javali Post, Chickmagalur District was referred to the Labour Court, Bangalore for adjudication;

AND WHEREAS the Labour Court has submitted to the State Government its award in respect of the said Industrial Dispute;

NOW, THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), the Government of Mysore are pleased to direct the publication of the said award as above, in the *Mysore Gazette.*

[No. PLM 504 LLD 64.]

By Order and in the name of the Governor of Mysore,

G. G. PUROHIT, *Under Secy.*

# GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

## (LABOUR DEPARTMENT)

*Labour Dispute.*—Industrial Dispute between the Workmen and the Management of Sannalsoor Estate, Balehonnur Post, Chickmagalur District.

Award of the Labour Court, Bangalore—Published.

Read the following papers:

1. Letter No. 571/65-66, dated 31st August 1965 Sri P. T. Kadkol, Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Bangalore.

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, BANGALORE.

*Dated the 31st day of August, 1965.*

**Present:**

Sri P. T. Kadkol, BS.C., LL.B., *Presiding Officer.*

**Reference No. 14 of 1965.**

Workmen represented by the Secretary, The Mysore State Plantation and General Labour Union, Chickmagalore.

*I Party*

*and*

The Management of Sannalsoor Estate, Balehonnur Post, Chickmagalore District.

*II Party*

*Reference*: Government Order No. PLM 81 LI D 65, Dated 1st April 1965.

**AWARD**

The Government of Mysore, being of opinion that an Industrial Dispute exists between the workmen and the management of Sannalsoor Estate, Balehonnur Post, Chickmagalore District, have referred it for adjudication to this court under Section 10 (1) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, by their

Order No. PLM 81 LLD 65 dated 1st April 1965, setting out the points of dispute as below for adjudication:—

> "Whether the management of Sannalsoor Estate, Balehonnur Post, Chickmagalore was justified in terminating the service of Sri Anthony Saldana with effect from 1st September 1964? If not, whether the said workman is entitled to reinstatement with back wages or any other relief?"

2. The cause of the aggrieved workman has been sponsored by the Mysore State Plantation and General Labour Union, Chickmagalore. This union, as representing the workmen is the first party and the management of Sannalsoor Estate is the second party in this proceeding. The Union is represented by Dr. E. Pushpam and the management is represented by Mr. G. B. Pinto.

3. In response to the notice issued by this Court, the first party submitted its claim statement dated 4th May 1965. Thereafter, a joint memorandum of settlement signed by both the parties was received by Registered post on July 7, 1965 asking the court to make an award in terms thereof. On receiving this joint memorandum, I directed the issue of a notice to both parties to remain present before me at Chickmagalore camp on 26th July 1965, to admit the settlement.

4. On 26th July 1965, Dr. Pushpam gave a memorandum marked Ex. A and Sri Pinto gave a memorandum marked Ex. B. admitting the settlement which has been marked Ex. C. On reading the terms of settlement I find that the claim of the employee Anthony Saldana has been fully settled out of court and the first party does not press the reference.

5. In the result, therefore, I proceed to make the following Award.

**AWARD**

Award is made as per the joint memorandum of settlement marked Ex. C. which should be annexed to this Award and be deemed forming part thereof. No costs.

P T. KADKOL,

*Presiding Officer,*
*Labour Court, Bangalore.*

BEFORE THE COURT OF THE PRESIDING OFFICER,
THE LABOUR COURT, BANGALORE.

*Dated the 29th June 1965.*

Ref. No. 14 of 1965.

*Sub :* Memorandum of Settlement.

The Management of Sannalsoor Estate, Balehonnur P. O. and the Mysore State Plantation and Genera. Labour Union have jointly arrived for a compromise this day 29th June 1965 and files this memorandum of Settlement to the Court since the worker Anthoni Saldhana has received all his benefits in full and final settlement of all his claims before the District Magistrate the authority under Payment of Wages Act of 1936.

Therefore this Union will not press this matter and prays this Hon'ble Court to kindly treat this case closed and pass an award similarly to this effect.

Management :
Sd/- H. A. Menezes.

Witness.
Sd/- G. B. Pinto.

Sd/-E. Pushpam, Representative for the worker.

Mysore State Plantation and General Labour Union, Chickmagalore (Affiliated to INTUC)

Seen to-day. Put up with file.
Intd. P. K. K.
7/7.

Ex. C.
Intd. P. R. K.
26/7.

Issue notice to both parties to admit Settlement.
Intd. P. T. K.
7/7.

" Copy "

P. T KADKOL,
*Presiding Officer,*
*Labour Court, Bangalore.*